

REMARKS

Applicants' Attorney would initially like to express appreciation to the Examiner in conducting an impromptu telephonic interview due to Applicants' need to file an Amendment rapidly to comply with statutory requirements.

In the above-identified Office Action the previous Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 16-18 and 20 under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by Cupit U.S. Patent No. 4,333,660 hereinafter referred to as "Cupit". Cupit discloses a seal that does include a single S-shaped convolution between securement area 5 and the largest diameter of the conical portion 10. Applicants' have amended the independent claim however to require at least two S-shaped convolutions. Cupit does not provide a teaching disclosure nor even suggestion within its discussion that more than a single S-shaped convolute would produce any benefit or should be pursued by one of ordinary skill in the art. The added limitation therefore overcomes the § 102 rejection of the Applicants' claims of Cupit.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-12 of 35 USC § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Cupit in view of Antanoski et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,316,405 hereinafter referred to as "Antanoski". In this rejection, the Examiner has recognized that two contiguous convolutes are not taught within the Cupit reference and therefore the Examiner has referred to Antanoski to teach the same. Applicants note two distinguishing points with respect thereto. The claim 5 limitation requires the convolutes be contiguous whereas the two convolutes of the Antanoski reference are spaced from another by an annular flat portion of the seal resulting in cancellation of claim 5. Further, Applicants have now amended the terminology of claim 5 and added it to claim 1 hereinabove to require that the convolutes be S-shaped. Antanoski clearly teaches U-shaped convolutes only. Therefore the S-shaped convolution distinguishes the application's claims from the references. For both of these reasons the rejection under 35 USC § 103 has believed to have been overcome. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 1 as opposed to claim 5 due to the cancellation of claim 5.

Since the Examiner has indicated allowable subject matter in the previous

Office Action with respect to claims 13-15, 19 and 21-23, Applicants have amended claims 13, 19 and 21 to exist in independent form by simply adding all of the limitations of the original claim 1 to the allowable subject matter of claims 13, 19 and 21. This Amendment is believed will render claims 13-15, 19 and 21-23 allowed in the next Action. Because of the amendment including limitations of original claim 5 and the S-shaped convolutes in claim 1 and the clarification to the combined claim requiring an S-shaped convolution Applicants further believe the that balance of the claims are also allowable and will be allowed in the next Action by the Examiner, which action is earnestly solicited.

In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted Amendment, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by the Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
Lois Z. Matczak et al.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By


Keith J. Murphy

Registration No. 33,979
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: November 17, 2005